UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,401	12/12/2003	Mi-Sook Nam	8733.993.00-US	9111
• • • • •	7590 08/16/200 DNG & ALDRIDGE L		EXAMINER	
1900 K STREE			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/733,401	NAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen G. Sherman	2629	

	Stephen G. Sherman	2629	}			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
HE REPLY FILED 03 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause			
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		coause			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	·			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	- · · ·	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	):					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	•	•				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			Î			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	· ·	• • •	·			
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		:			
		AMR A.	AWAD			
		SUPERVISORY PA				
	•	4 About	hu			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment presented cancelled claim 3 and added the limitation to claim 1. Claims 2 and 4-7 previsouly depended from claim 1 without the limitation of claim 3. Similarly claim 9 was cancelled and added to claim 8, however, claims 10 and 22 previously depended from claim 8 without the limitations of claim 9. Claims 12 and 16-18 were cancelled and the limitations added to claim 11, however, claims 13-15, 21 and 23 previously depended from claim 11 without the limitations of claims 12 and 16-18. Thus the scope of claims 2, 4-7, 10, 13-15 and 21-23 has been changed. If these claims were cancelled or written in independent form as previously presented then the amendment could be entered for purposes of appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to claims 1, 8 and 11, the applicant argues that Yanagi specifically fails to teach the limitation "a backlight controller connected to the sequential backlight to control the timing of light emissions in the transmission mode or reflection mode" however claims 1 and 8 only require that the backlight controller controls timing of light emissions in the transmission mode. The applicant even admits on page 7 in the last paragraph that Yanagi teaches of a syncronous circuit that synchronizes actuation of the backlight that carries out time-sharing actution, i.e. the applicant admits that Yanagi teaches of a backlight controller connected to the sequential backlight to control the timing of light emissions. The applicant argues on page 8, lines 4-10 that Yanagi does not teach of controlling the timing of light emissions in the transmission mode or reflection mode, however, it is not required by the claim for Yanagi to teach of controlling light emissions in the reflection mode. In fact the claim requires the backlight to be off in the reflection mode. Furthermore, the applicant individually attacks the Yanagi reference instead of taking into account that the rejection was based upon a combination of references, and the combination of the references teach the claimed limitations.